P. 01

# RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

### TRANSMITTAL LETTER

NOV 1 2 2004

In re Application of: Stanley B. MIRVISS et al.	: Docket: ACR6100US
Int'l Application No.: PCT/US99/31246 Int'l Filing Date: December 30, 1999 Priority Date: December 31, 1998 Serial No.: 09/869,931	Examiner: Taylor V. OH Group Art Unit: 1625
For: CATIONIC GEMINI AND RELATED MULTIPLE HYDROPHILIC/HYDROPHOBIC FUNTIONAL COMPOUNDS AND THEIR USE AS SURFACTANTS	CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION It is hereby certified that the attached: Response to Office Action; (
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	
Sir:  In the document of the d	
☐ Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of ti	me under 37 CFR 1.136 of:
	Two Months (\$ 430.00) Four Months (\$1530.00)
The total fee believed due is \$_0.00 Please c which may be due (including filing fees under 37 CFR 1.17) to Deposit Account No. 01-1350. If an been requested above, Applicant hereby petitions attached document(s) to be timely. A duplicate co	OFR 1.16 and processing fees under 37 extension of time is required but has not for an extension of time sufficient for the
Re At	alph J. Mancini torney for Applicant(s) eg. No. 34,054

Akzo Nobel Inc. Intellectual Property Dept. 7 Livingstone Avenue Dobbs Ferry, NY 10522-3408 Tel No.: (914) 674-5465

## RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 1 2 2004

### PATENT IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:

Stanley B. MIRVISS et al.

Int'l Application No.: PCT/US99/31246 Int'l Filing Date: December 30, 1999 Priority Date: December 31, 1998

Serial No.: 09/869,931

For: CATIONIC GEMINI AND RELATED MULTIPLE HYDROPHILIC/HYDROPHOBIC FUNTIONAL COMPOUNDS AND THEIR USE

AS SURFACTANTS

Commissioner for Patents P. O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 Docket: ACR6100US

Examiner: Taylor V. OH

Group Art Unit: 1625

On November 12, 2004

Christina Cangelosi

Christina Cangelosi

### RESTRICTION RESPONSE

Sir:

In response to the Requirement for Restriction mailed October 14, 2004, applicants hereby elect, with traverse, to prosecute Group I, claims 1-6, 15-24 and 25-32 on the merits. However, the examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the restriction requirement in view of the following remarks.

#### Remarks

Initially, applicants note that they received two separate Office Actions mailed out on October 14, 2004. They are substantially the same...except for one thing: one action had **two groups** of claims and the second action had **six groups** of claims. Applicants contacted the examiner regarding the situation but failed to resolve it with any clarity. Since applicants are on a time clock for responding, they have merely responded to the first action, and will await further comment from the examiner in due course.

In the office action mailed October 14, 2004, the examiner required applicants to restrict the invention to one of the following groups: